

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for examining the application. Applicants have amended claims 1, 11, 13, and 41, as is discussed further below, to expedite prosecution on the merits and further distinguish the claimed invention from the cited prior art. Support for the amendment of claims 1, 11, 13, and 41 may be found throughout the specification, and the amendment of claims 1, 11, 13, and 41 does not constitute the addition of new matter. With the amendment, claims 1-13, 15-31, and 41-50 are now pending.

Applicants' Note

Applicants are particularly grateful to Examiner Basehoar for taking the time to grant an interview with Applicants' Attorney on October 4, 2007. During the interview, the Examiner and Applicants' Attorney further clarified their respective positions on the claim language and the cited references. Applicants' Attorney purposed new amendments to the independent claims, which are reflected in the claims above and discussed further below.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-13, 15-31, and 41-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,909,678 to Bergman et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,122,647 to Horowitz et al.

Applicants' amended independent claim 1 now requires, among other things, displaying a hyperlink for an element in the form, to indicate to a user that a control is available for the element, said hyperlink including a hyperlink target, the hyperlink target identified by a Universal Resource Locator (URL), said hyperlink providing one of the group consisting of (i) a link from the form to another location, wherein the another location is identified by a particular URL in the hyperlink target and (ii) a link from the form to another file, wherein the another file is identified by a particular URL in the hyperlink target.

The Examiner previously cited to Fig. 9 element 911; col. 3 lines 17-18; Fig. 4 element 200; col. 3 lines 6-28, 46-49, and 57-67; col. 4 lines 1-9; and col. 7 lines 31-44 of Bergman et al. as disclosing the entirety of the limitation, prior to its current amendment, with the exception of “said hyperlink including a reference to a Universal Resource Locator (URL)”, which, as the Examiner himself admits, is not taught by Bergman et al. For this, the Examiner cites to col. 10 lines 28-67 and col. 11 lines 1-2 of Horowitz et al.

Applicants respectfully submit that the limitation as amendment distinguishes Applicants’ amended independent claim 1 from Bergman et al. in combination with Horowitz et al. The entirety of the prosecution to this point has focused on the meaning of the term “hyperlink”. Applicants have amended claim 1 to clearly indicate that a hyperlink includes a hyperlink target, the hyperlink target identified by a Universal Resource Locator (URL), said hyperlink providing one of the group consisting of (i) a link from the form to another location, wherein the another location is identified by a particular URL in the hyperlink target and (ii) a link from the form to another file, wherein the another file is identified by a particular URL in the hyperlink target. Bergman et al. does not teach or even suggest a hyperlink target, much less a hyperlink target identified by a Universal Resource Locator, and certainly not a link from the form to another location, wherein the another location is identified by a particular URL in the hyperlink target, or a link from the form to another file, wherein the another file is identified by a particular URL in the hyperlink target, as required by Applicants’ amended independent claim 1.

Indeed, the alleged equivalent to a hyperlink in Bergman et al. is a phrase receptacle. The phrase receptacle does not include a hyperlink target identified by a Universal Resource Locator. Rather, Bergman et al. does teach that “the user may click on any **empty** receptacle displayed on the palette and see the phrase and objects that the palette will accept highlighted in the menu boxes.” Bergman et al. col. 7 lines 38-41 (emphasis added). All this accomplishes is to highlight, or otherwise indicate to a user, what terms may be used in what phrase receptacles. There is no link from the form to another location, wherein the another location is identified by a particular URL in the

hyperlink target, or a link from the form to another file, wherein the another file is identified by a particular URL in the hyperlink target, as required by Applicants' amended independent claim 1. The connection between a particular phrase receptacle, and what terms shown elsewhere on the display that may be insertable into that particular phrase receptacle, does not rise to the level of being another location or another file identified by a URL in a hyperlink target. It is simply a relationship, pre-programmed as a constraint into the template that includes the phrase receptacles; see *at least* col. 6 lines 40-64 and col. 7 lines 31-44 of Bergman et al. Indeed, to change that relationship, such that different terms would be accepted by a particular phrase receptacle, would require that the user re-program and re-compile the phrase template to effect a change in the constraint. In contrast, to change the relationship embodied by the hyperlink in the current application merely requires that a user change the hyperlink target of that hyperlink from one URL to another URL.

Finally, Applicants respectfully note that, because Bergman et al. does not teach a hyperlink including a hyperlink target, the hyperlink target identified by a Universal Resource Locator, it is improper to suggest that Bergman et al. may be combined with any reference that specifically teaches a URL as a hyperlink target, such as Horowitz et al. does.

In summary, Bergman et al. does not teach or suggest displaying a hyperlink for an element in the form, to indicate to a user that a control is available for the element, said hyperlink including a hyperlink target, the hyperlink target identified by a Universal Resource Locator (URL), said hyperlink providing one of the group consisting of (i) a link from the form to another location, wherein the another location is identified by a particular URL in the hyperlink target and (ii) a link from the form to another file, wherein the another file is identified by a particular URL in the hyperlink target, as required by Applicants' amended independent claim 1. Thus, the combination of Bergman et al. with Horowitz et al. fails to teach or suggest Applicants' independent claim 1, and therefore Applicants' amended independent claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Bergman et al. with Horowitz et al.

Applicants' amended independent claims 11, 13, and 41 all include limitations similar to those of Applicants' allowable amended independent claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reason(s) given above with regards to Applicants' allowable amended independent claim 1, Applicants' amended independent claims 11, 13, and 41 are themselves not obvious in light of Bergman et al. in view of Horowitz et al., and thus, Applicants' amended independent claims 11, 13, and 41 are allowable over the combination of Bergman et al. with Horowitz et al.

Applicants' dependent claims 2-10, 12, 14-31, and 42-50 depend from, respectively, Applicants' allowable amended independent claims 1, 11, 13, and 41. Therefore, for at least the reason(s) given above with regards to Applicants' allowable amended independent claims 1, 11, 13, and 41, Applicants' dependent claims 2-10, 12, 14-31, and 42-50 are themselves not obvious in light of Bergman et al. in view of Horowitz et al., and thus, Applicants' dependent claims 2-10, 12, 14-31, and 42-50 are allowable over the combination of Bergman et al. with Horowitz et al.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe this Amendment and Response to be fully responsive to the present Office Action. Thus, based on the foregoing Remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that this application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request allowance of the application.

Applicants hereby petition for any extension of time required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is any fee occasioned by this response that is not paid, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

Should the enclosed papers or fees be considered incomplete, Applicants respectfully request that the Patent Office contact the undersigned collect at the telephone number provided below.

Applicants invite the Examiner to contact the Applicants' undersigned Attorney if any issues are deemed to remain prior to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

/SPM/

Shaun P. Montana, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 54,320
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: OID06-36(07601)

Dated: October 11, 2007